



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

commentary shows how much better work is done by an editor who is thoroughly familiar with his author than by one who takes up a play merely to edit it.

I venture to make two criticisms or suggestions: First, there are too many short notes like (243) "*cedo*, 'give me' (origin uncertain)"; (245) "*ut*, exclamatory"; (264) "*ire*, 'come,'" and 513, 548-553, etc. Second, notes like those on 138 and 611, on 342, 358, 207, 510, which consist of three or four references to parallel passages, are, even when the list of passages is fairly complete, rather materials for notes than actual notes. But I am aware that an editor has not unlimited space at his command.

E. P. MORRIS.

A Finnish Grammar, by C. N. E. ELIOT. Oxford, 1890.

Finnish and Hungarian are the two most important members of the Ugrian branch of the extensive Ural-Altaic family of languages. A Finnish grammar in English really marks a new epoch in the study of this important philological domain, as investigations have hitherto been confined almost exclusively to Russian, Swedish and Hungarian scholars.

The study of the Altaic group is especially interesting in view of its supposed connection with the non-Semitic language of the cuneiform inscriptions, the so-called Sumero-Akkadian. Various distinguished scholars have endeavored to establish an affinity; Lenormant, for example, fancied that he saw a resemblance between Sumero-Akkadian and the Ugro-Finnic family, even going so far as to draw a comparison between the great Finnish epic, *Kalevala*, and the Sumerian mythology; but this hypothesis was ably refuted by Dr. Donner in his Appendix to Haupt's "*Akkadische Sprache*," 1881. Hommel's attempt to identify Akkadian as a branch of the Turco-Tartaric group is, in spite of his confident tone, lacking in sober judgment. The immense difference in point of time between Akkadian and the modern Altaic languages must necessarily increase the difficulty of an accurate comparison, especially as we cannot know what changes the Altaic idioms may have undergone during that period.

Mr. Eliot certainly deserves the credit of having opened up an unexplored field to English-speaking philologists, as his work is, as far as I know, the only grammar of Finnish in our language.

In his introduction, pp. ix-xlvi, he gives a treatise on the language in general, taking up in order its chief peculiarities, such as vowel harmony, vocalic differentiation, etc., concluding with a few pages on the relation of Finnish to the cognate dialects, Turkish, Magyar and the Siberian idioms.

Mr. Bain, in his review of this work in the Academy, January 10th, 1891, quite rightly takes exception to the author's philology, in seeing resemblances between the Finnish and Latin declensions, and in considering that the language presents no great differences from the Aryan family. While it is undoubtedly wrong to consider Finnish as anything but a well-marked agglutinative type, still it is interesting to note that there exists in these dialects a decided tendency to true inflection, so much so as to obscure in certain endings the distinctive differences between inflection and agglutination. In other words, Finnish and Magyar have advanced considerably from the primitive monosyllabic type, but have by no means reached the inflectional stage.

Mr. Eliot, in his remarks on accent, p. xiii, has not stated the case as accurately as one could wish. He admits the rule of invariable accentuation of the first syllable, but states that his ear is inclined in many words to place the voice-stress on the ultimate, especially when it is long; for example, in the word *revitätän* he considers the accent to be on the last syllable. The probability is that this long final syllable has a secondary accent, the chief tone resting on the first syllable, and as the difference between main and secondary accent is in all likelihood not strongly marked, and extremely difficult to be distinguished by a foreigner, the author is scarcely justified in doubting the truth of the regular rule.

In the grammatical statements, not only are the sections on the infinitives, which are considered the main difficulty of Finnish, especially lucid, but the paragraphs devoted to the use of the cases, of which the language has fifteen, are extremely clear and exhaustive.

In the chrestomathy the selections from *Kalevala* give an excellent idea of the general style and swing of the lines. The explanatory and grammatical foot-notes are very full, but it would be more convenient for reference if a small glossary had been appended.

An English version of *Kalevala*, by Mr. Crawford, appeared in New York in 1881, and the style of the epic has been made familiar by Longfellow's *Hiawatha*.

As Mr. Eliot's work does not pretend to be a comparative philological treatise it cannot be judged from this point of view; but regarding it as a whole, it must be admitted that the author has certainly succeeded in placing before the public a clear and concise handbook of the Finnish language.

—
J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

English Prose: its Elements, History, and Usage. By JOHN EARLE, M. A., Rawlinsonian Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. London, Smith, Elder & Co., 1891 (pp. x, 530).

The history and development of English prose is a subject that has been heretofore greatly neglected. We have had works on the history of the English language, and numerous works, more or less valuable, on composition and rhetoric, devoted to a statement of what is conceived to be correct modern usage. But a critical study of English prose from the earliest times, directed to an analysis of its elements and their historical development, and an effort to ascertain how modern usage has come to be what it is, has heretofore been wanting, so that Prof. Earle is right in stating that, "whereas our poetry has called forth a succession of critical literature from the times of Elizabeth until now, no like attention has been paid to English prose"; and in claiming that "the present work is quite new, not merely in details and in treatment, but in its very conception." The importance of the work and its correct appreciation of the place of English philology in the study of English prose, justify a notice in this Journal.

The general plan of the work may be given in Professor Earle's own words: "First, there are four chapters in which the subject is treated analytically; then five chapters in which the treatment is synthetic, and progressively so,